

REMARKS

35 U.S.C. § 102

The Ulinski reference cannot anticipate the currently pending claims for the simple reason that the Ulinski reference discloses only a system for a static, installed photocopy machine (See Fig. 1). The currently pending claims are all drawn to repairs for a “mobile machine” such as a combine or tractor. The Ulinski reference teaches direct hardwire telecommunications between a fixed static machine and a home, central computer. The Ulinski reference nowhere discloses, let alone teaches, repair planning for a mobile machine. The recited claim limitation to systems for mobile machines not being found in the Ulinski reference, the Ulinski cannot anticipate the pending claims. The same is true for independent claim 28, and all the claims that depend from claims 1 and 28.

The office action appears to misread claim 16. Claim 16 does not claim sending data from the central processor to the machine, as is stated in the office action, but clearly recites the transmission of data from the machine’s diagnostic system to the local computer system. No such structure or step is disclosed in any of the prior art references of record.

35 U.S.C. § 103

For the same reasons as stated above, the Ulinski reference cannot suggest or motivate the system structurally recited in the pending claims and in fact it teaches away from it by teaching a direct communication between the machine to be repaired, the photocopier, and the central computer. Since this is unworkable for the application of the present invention regarding mobile

machines such as tractors, the teaching of Ulinski does not enable, suggest or motivate the system recited in the pending claims.

This novel and inventive distinction is inherent in the pending claims' recitation of repair of mobile machines. The current amendments to independent claims 1 and 28 that the local computer system is independent of the mobile machine itself further particularly points out and distinctly claims the inventive distinctions of the pending claims over the references of record.

Claim 38 stands rejected over the combination of Ulinski with Michael et al. Michael et al references a remote video display to a central technician who is assumed to be more experienced than the onsite technician. The current amendment to claim 38 further particularly points out and distinctly claims that the invention of the pending claims does not require two technicians.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



By: Robert C. Haldiman, Reg. No. 45,437
Husch & Eppenberger, LLC
190 Carondelet Plaza
St. Louis, MO 63105
314-480-1500
314-480-1505 (FACSIMILE)